



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

The Dow Chemical Company  
Intellectual Property Section  
P.O. Box 1967  
Midland MI 48641-1967

**COPY MAILED**

**JUN 04 2009**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Oswald et al.	:	
Application No. 10/566,937	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: 02/02/2006	:	
Attorney Docket No. 62781A	:	

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.181 (no fee), filed January 13, 2009, requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application was held abandoned for failure to reply to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed May 23, 2008, which set period of one month or thirty days, whichever was longer, to respond. In the absence of a timely filed reply, the application became abandoned on June 24, 2008. On December 4, 2008, the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment.

Petitioner asserts that the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed May 23, 2008, was not received.

A review of the written record indicates no irregularity in the mailing of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment and in the absence of any irregularity, there is a strong presumption that the Notice was properly mailed to the practitioner at the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was not in fact received.

As stated in Section 711.03(c)(I)(A) of the Manual for Patent Examining Procedure:

In Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of Delgar, an allegation that an Office action was

never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of Delgar is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

After reviewing the documents submitted on petition, the Office concludes that the showing of record is sufficient to warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. The practitioner submitted a copy of the master docket showing all replies docketed for a date one month from the mail date of the nonreceived Notice. The practitioner stated the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment would have been entered in this docketing system had it been received and docketed. The practitioner attested to the fact that a search of the records indicated that the

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was not received. Accordingly, petitioner presented the required showing under 37 CFR 1.181.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.181 is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is hereby withdrawn.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 1796 for further action on the reply submitted with the petition.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3211.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Christina Tartera Donnell". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first name "Christina" being the most prominent.

Christina Tartera Donnell  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions